UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

M N

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,481	12/06/2001	Jonathan James Stone	282496US8X	3235

22850   7590   07/05/2007
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
PAN, JOSEPH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/05/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _20 April 2007_.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under _Ex parte Quayle_, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-16,20-36,38-54,67-70 and 73-125_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _31-36,38-54,67-70 and 74-125_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-16,20-30 and 73_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _06 December 2001_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a) ☒ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

   1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Applicant elected species 1, claims 1-13, 14-16, 20-30 and 73 with traverse in response filed on April 20, 2007. Claims 31-36, 38-54, 67-70, 74-125 are withdrawn from further consideration as being non-elected claims.

Applicant's election with traverse of species 1, claims 1-13, 14-16, 20-30 and 73 in the reply filed on April 20, 2007 is acknowledged. The traversal is <u>on the grounds</u> <u>that a search and examination of the entire application using electronic searching would</u> <u>not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner, whereas it would clearly be burdensome</u> <u>on Applicants to be required to file, prosecute and maintain separate applications and</u> <u>patents</u>. This is not found persuasive because this application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

Species 1:   Figures 11 associate with claims 1-13, 14-16, 20-30, 73.

Species 2:   Figure 5 associates with 31.

Species 3:   Figure 3 associates with claims 32-35, 97-98, 100-125.

Species 4:   Figure 1 associates with claims 38-46, 70, 74-96.

Species 5:   Figures 8 & 9 associate with claims 47-54.

The species are independent or distinct because each of the various disclosed species details a mutual exclusive characteristic of:

Species 1:   A method and an arrangement of watermarking and transferring watermarked material in a system including transaction server, first and second clients, a first apparatus for applying a perceptible watermark to the material and a second apparatus for removing the watermark.

Species 2:   A camera comprising an information material processing apparatus, a data generation processor, a recording apparatus, and a data processor.

Species 3:   A method and an arrangement of watermarking and transferring watermarked material in a system including one or more processors.

Species 4:   A method and an arrangement of watermarking and transferring watermarked material in a system including a transaction server, a first client

for applying a perceptible watermark to the material, and a second client for removing the watermark.

Species 5:   A server comprising a first mechanism configured to receive and store data identifying watermarked material, a second mechanism configured to receive identifying data, a third mechanism configured to monitor, and a forth mechanism configured to provide the removal data.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2.   Applicant's response filed on December 6, 2006 has been carefully considered.

Claim Objections

3.   Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim contain the following:

"…transferring from the transaction server to the first apparatus (i) data for creating a watermark; the creating data including (a) data defining an invertible algorithm and (b) data for creating at least one security key associated with the algorithm, and (ii) data for creating a material identifier; using said first apparatus to apply a material identifier to the material and to apply a perceptible watermark to the material in accordance with the invertible algorithm, wherein the perceptible watermark is applied to the material as part of a compression of the material, and the invertible algorithm provides a perceivable impairment to the material; transferring from the first client to the transaction server said material identifier and data for inverting the algorithm including said at least one key; transferring the watermarked material to the second client; deriving said material identifier from the material; transferring the

identifier from the second client to the transaction server; subject to predetermined

conditions being satisfied, transferring from the transaction server to <u>the second</u>

<u>apparatus</u> watermark removal data associated with said material identifier...". The

terms used in the claim: "the transaction server", "the first client", "the second client",

"the first apparatus", and the "the second apparatus" are not defined when they are

referred to.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-16, 20-25, 29-30, 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Yoshiura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,131,162) in view of

Musgrave (U.S. Patent No. 6,208,746 B1), and further in view of Milsted et al. (U.S.

Patent No. 6,345,256 B1).

<u>Referring to claims 1, 20, 73</u>:

i.   Yoshiura et al. teach:

A method of watermarking and transferring watermarked material in

a system comprising a server, first and second clients (see figure 14, elements 1120,

1110, 1100 of Yoshiura et al.), a apparatus for applying a watermark to the material (see column 9, lines 25-27 of Yoshiura et al.) and a apparatus for removing the watermark (see column 9, lines 32-34 of Yoshiura et al.), the method comprising the steps of:

Transferring data from the server to the apparatus for creating watermark, the creating data including data defining an invertible algorithm and data for creating at least one security key associated with the algorithm (see column 6, lines 9-19 of Yoshiura et al.), and data for creating a material identifier (see column 3, lines 18-22 of Yoshiura et al.);

Using the apparatus to apply a material identifier to the material and applying a watermark to the material (see column 3, lines 13-15 of Yoshiura et al.);

Transferring the material identifier from the client to the server (see figure 14, element 1611 of Yoshiura et al.);

Transferring the watermarked material (see column 23, lines 8-14 of Yoshiura et al.);

Deriving the material identifier from the watermarked material (see column 23, lines 16-20 of Yoshiura et al.);

Transferring the material identifier to the server (see column 23, lines 16-20 of Yoshiura et al.);

Subject to predetermined conditions being satisfied, transferring the watermark removal data to the watermark removal apparatus to remove the watermark from the material (see column 28, lines 29-45 of Yoshiura et al.).

However, Yoshiura et al. do not specifically mention applying a perceptible watermark to the material, in accordance with an invertible algorithm, the perceptible watermark being applied to the material as part of a compression of the material, the invertible algorithm providing a perceivable impairment to the material.

Also, Yoshiura et al. do not specifically mention the security key which is associated with the invertible algorithm, neither do Yoshiura et al. specifically mention the material identifier.

ii. Musgrave teaches a biometric watermark system wherein Musgrave discloses applying a perceptible watermark to the material (see column 4, lines 66-67; and column 5, lines 1-10 of Musgrave), in accordance with an invertible algorithm (see column 3, lines 50-60 of Musgrave), the perceptible watermark being applied to the material as part of a compression of the material (see column 3, lines 40-49 of Musgrave), the invertible algorithm providing a perceivable impairment to the material (see column 4, lines 66-67; and column 5, lines 1-10 of Musgrave).

Milsted et al. disclose a method to package digital content for electronic distribution using the identity of the source content, wherein Milsted et al. disclose the security key and the associated invertible algorithm (see column 24, lines 16-20 of Milsted et al.), and the material identifier (see abstract of Milsted et al.).

iii. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Musgrave into the system of Yoshiura et al. to apply a perceptible watermark to the material, in accordance with an invertible algorithm, the perceptible watermark being applied to the material as part of a compression of the material, the invertible algorithm providing a perceivable impairment to the material.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Milsted et al. into the system of Yoshiura et al. to use a security key which is associated with the invertible algorithm, and use the material identifier.

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to have applied the teaching of Musgrave into the system of Yoshiura et al. to apply a perceptible watermark to the material, in accordance with an invertible algorithm, the perceptible watermark being applied to the material as part of a compression of the material, the invertible algorithm providing a perceivable impairment to the material, because Musgrave's teaching not only protects licensing and royalty payments associated with information, such as software and music, but also ensures that the products are delivered to and used only by the individual authorized to receive and use the information (see column 5, lines 14-18 of Musgrave).

The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to have applied the teaching of Milsted et al. into the system of Yoshiura et al. to use a security key which is associated with the invertible algorithm, because the security key can be used to enhance the security, so that only the End-User Player Application 195 that is knowledgeable of the embedding algorithm and the associated scrambling key is able to read or modify the embedded data (see column 24, lines 16-20 of Milsted et al.).

The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to have applied the teaching of Milsted et al. into the system of Yoshiura et al. to use the material identifier, because the material identifier facilitates identifying a material (see abstract of Milsted et al.).

Referring to claim 2:

Yoshiura et al., Musgrave and Milsted et al. teach the claimed subject matter: a method of watermarking and transferring watermarked material (see claim 1 above). Yoshiura et al. further disclose that the data is compressed (see column 3, lines 2-4 of Yoshiura et al.).

Referring to claims 3-4:

Yoshiura et al., Musgrave and Milsted et al. teach the claimed subject matter: a method of watermarking and transferring watermarked material (see claim 1 above). Yoshiura et al. further disclose that the removal data for the watermark can be provided by the server (see column 28, lines 29-45 of Yoshiura et al.).

Referring to claims 5-7, 9:

Yoshiura et al., Musgrave and Milsted et al. teach the claimed subject matter: a method of watermarking and transferring watermarked material (see claim 1 above). Yoshiura et al. further disclose using a data carrier to carry out the watermarking functionalities (see column 14, lines 55-61 of Yoshiura et al.).

Referring to claim 8:

Yoshiura et al., Musgrave and Milsted et al. teach the claimed subject matter: a method of watermarking and transferring watermarked material (see claim 1 above). Milsted et al. disclose the metadata (see column 60, lines 47 of Milsted et al.).

Referring to claims 10-12:

Yoshiura et al., Musgrave and Milsted et al. teach the claimed subject matter: a method of watermarking and transferring watermarked material (see claim 1 above). Yoshiura et al. further disclose that the system may be used in seller and buyer mode in electronic commerce wherein conditions of sale apply (see column 15, lines 26-31 of Yoshiura et al.).

<u>Referring to claim 13:</u>

Yoshiura et al., Musgrave and Milsted et al. teach the claimed subject matter: a method of watermarking and transferring watermarked material (see claim 1 above). Yoshiura et al. further disclose using a recording medium (see column 9, lines 48-50 of Yoshiura et al.).

<u>Referring to claim 14:</u>

i.   Yoshiura et al. teach:

A data carrier wherein data is stored for creating a watermark, so that upon receiving an encrypted content, the data carrier will embed a digital watermark to the content (see column 14, lines 55-61 of Yoshiura et al.).

However, Yoshiura et al. do not specifically mention applying a perceptible watermark to the material, in accordance with an invertible algorithm, the perceptible watermark being applied to the material as part of a compression of the material, the invertible algorithm providing a perceivable impairment to the material.

Also, Yoshiura et al. do not specifically mention the security key which is associated with the invertible algorithm, neither do Yoshiura et al. specifically mention the material identifier.

ii.   Musgrave teaches a biometric watermark system wherein Musgrave discloses applying a perceptible watermark to the material (see column 4, lines 66-67; and column 5, lines 1-10 of Musgrave), in accordance with an invertible algorithm (see column 3, lines 50-60 of Musgrave), the perceptible watermark being applied to the material as part of a compression of the material (see column 3, lines 40-49 of Musgrave), the invertible algorithm providing a perceivable impairment to the material (see column 4, lines 66-67; and column 5, lines 1-10 of Musgrave).

Milsted et al. disclose a method to package digital content for electronic distribution using the identity of the source content, wherein Milsted et al. disclose the security key and the associated invertible algorithm (see column 24, lines 16-20 of Milsted et al.), and the material identifier (see abstract of Milsted et al.).

iii. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Musgrave into the system of Yoshiura et al. to apply a perceptible watermark to the material, in accordance with an invertible algorithm, the perceptible watermark being applied to the material as part of a compression of the material, the invertible algorithm providing a perceivable impairment to the material, and use the material identifier.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Milsted et al. into the system of Yoshiura et al. to use a security key which is associated with the invertible algorithm.

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to have applied the teaching of Musgrave into the system of Yoshiura et al. to apply a perceptible watermark to the material, in accordance with an invertible algorithm, the perceptible watermark being applied to the material as part of a compression of the material, the invertible algorithm providing a perceivable impairment to the material, because Musgrave's teaching not only protects licensing and royalty payments associated with information, such as software and music, but also ensures that the products are delivered to and used only by the individual authorized to receive and use the information (see column 5, lines 14-18 of Musgrave).

The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to have applied the teaching of Milsted et al. into the system of Yoshiura et al. to use a security key which is associated with the invertible algorithm, because the security key can be used to enhance the security, so that only the End-User Player Application 195 that is knowledgeable of the embedding algorithm and the associated scrambling key is able to read or modify the embedded data (see column 24, lines 16-20 of Milsted et al.).

The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to have applied the teaching of Milsted et al. into the system of Yoshiura et al. to use the material identifier, because the material identifier facilitates identifying a material (see abstract of Milsted et al.).

Referring to claims 15-16:

Yoshiura et al., Musgrave and Milsted et al. teach the claimed subject matter: using a data carrier to create the watermark (see claim 14 above). Yoshiura et al. further disclose that the data carrier is a smart card (see column 14, lines 55-61 of Yoshiura et al.).

Referring to claims 21-24:

Yoshiura et al., Musgrave and Milsted et al. teach the claimed subject matter: a system of watermarking and transferring watermarked material (see claim 20 above). Yoshiura et al. further disclose that the content may contain different types of data, such as text data, drawing data, audio data, or video data (see column 11, lines 45-48 of Yoshiura et al.).

Referring to claim 25:

Yoshiura et al., Musgrave and Milsted et al. teach the claimed subject matter: a system of watermarking and transferring watermarked material (see claim 20 above). Yoshiura et al. further disclose:

An information material processing apparatus operable to receive signals representative of information material, and to adapt said signals to the effect of introducing a reversible modification material in accordance with a modification key (see figure 2, elements 211, 216, 220 of Yoshiura et al.);

A data generation processor operable to generate data identifying said information material (see column 3, lines 18-22 of Yoshiura et al.);

A recording apparatus operable to record said adapted signals (see column 9, lines 48-50 of Yoshiura et al.);

A data carrier used by the data processor to store watermarking data (see column 14, lines 55-61 of Yoshiura et al.).

Musgrave teaches a biometric watermark system wherein Musgrave discloses applying a perceptible watermark to the material (see column 4, lines 66-67; and column 5, lines 1-10 of Musgrave), in accordance with an invertible algorithm (see column 3, lines 50-60 of Musgrave), the perceptible watermark being applied to the material as part of a compression of the material (see column 3, lines 40-49 of Musgrave), the invertible algorithm providing a perceivable impairment to the material (see column 4, lines 66-67; and column 5, lines 1-10 of Musgrave).

Milsted et al. disclose a method to package digital content for electronic distribution using the identity of the source content, wherein Milsted et al. disclose the modification key and the associated invertible algorithm (see column 24, lines 16-20 of Milsted et al.), and the material identifier (see abstract of Milsted et al.).

Referring to claims 29:

Yoshiura et al., Musgrave and Milsted et al. teach the claimed subject matter: an apparatus for watermarking (see claim 20 above). Milsted et al. further disclose creating a unique material identifier (see abstract of Milsted et al.).

Referring to claims 30:

Yoshiura et al., Musgrave and Milsted et al. teach the claimed subject matter: an apparatus for watermarking (see claim 20 above). Milsted et al. further disclose the signal (see column 24, lines 23-27 of Wilsted et al.).

6.   Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshiura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,131,162) in view of Musgrave (U.S. Patent No. 6,208,746 B1), and further in view of Milsted et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,345,256 B1), and further in view of Finkeistein et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,185,733).

Referring to claim 26:

        i.   Yoshiura et al., Musgrave and Milsted et al. teach the claimed subject matter: a apparatus for watermarking and transferring (see claim 20 above). However, they do not specifically mention that the recording medium including capacity for ancillary data, and the recording medium.

        ii.   Finkeistein et al. disclose a system wherein the recording medium includes capacity for ancillary data (see column 7, lines 33-36 of Finkeistein et al.), and the linear recording medium (see column 1, lines 32-37 of Finkeistein et al.).

        iii.   It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Finkeistein et al. into the system of Yoshiura et al., Musgrave and Milsted et al. to use a recording medium with the capacity of ancillary data for the watermarked material, and use a linear recording medium.

        iv.   The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to have applied the teaching of Finseistein et al. into the system of Yoshiura et al., Musgrave and Milsted et al. to use the recording medium with the capacity for ancillary data, because it is well known in the recording art that the ancillary data for an area of interest used to enhance the analysis of the primary remotely sensed data (see phrase 'ancillary data' in AGI GIS dictionary).

        The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to have applied the teaching of Finseistein et al. into the system of Yoshiura et al., Musgrave and Milsted et al. to use a linear recoding meduim, because linear recording medium is popular and widely used in recording industry.

        7.   Claims 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshiura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,131,162) in view of Musgrave (U.S. Patent No. 6,208,746 B1), and further in view of Milsted et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,345,256 B1), and further in view of Gell (U.S. Patent No. 6,577,858).

Referring to claims 27-28:

i.   Yoshiura et al., Musgrave and Milsted et al. teach the claimed subject matter: an apparatus for watermarking (see claim 20 above). However, they do not specifically mention that the data carrier is a hand insert-able smart card.

ii.   Gell discloses a system wherein the system integrates all the functions of the customer accounting unit onto a hand insert-able smart card (see column 9, lines 66-67; and column 10, lines 1-4 of Gell).

iii.   It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Gell into the system of Yoshiura et al., Musgrave and Milsted et al. to provide a hand insert-able smart card to store watermarking data.

iv.   The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to have applied the teaching of Gell into the system of Yoshiura et al., Musgrave and Milsted et al. to provide a hand insert-able smart card to store watermarking data, because by storing watermarking data in a smart card, data storage becomes distributed. Also, this would provide convenience for the customer since the customer is more easily able to rely upon data which has been stored in the smart card (see column 3, lines 31-43 of Gell).

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments, filed on December 6, 2006, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues:

"Col. 9, lines 32-34 of <u>Yoshiura</u> only states "apparatus for extracting from the extracted mark..." "Extracting does not mean that the watermark is removed from the content." (see page 5, 3rd paragraph, Applicant's Arguments/Remarks)

Examiner maintains:

Yoshiura discloses "If the rule used by the purchaser system 200 to embed the
digital signature into the content is known only to the provider and if <u>the digital signature</u>
<u>may be removed from the content</u> according to that rule, <u>the content from which the</u>
<u>digital signature is removed</u> may be used instead of the original content." (see column
14, lines 20-25 of Yoshiura, emphasis added).

Therefore, Yoshiura discloses removing the digital signature [i.e., watermark]
from the content.

Applicant argues:

"In <u>Yoshiura</u>, the transaction server does not transfer data for creating the
watermark" (see page 7, 1st paragraph, Applicant's Arguments/Remarks)

Examiner maintains:

The independent claims are rejected on 35 USC § 103, utlizaing references
Yoshiura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,131,162) in view of Musgrave (U.S. Patent No.
6,208,746 B1), and further in view of Milsted et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,345,256 B1).

Musgrave discloses transferring data for creating the watermark (see figure 1,
element 24 'biometric data', and element 26 'encoder', of Musgrave). Therefore, the references used in the Office Action disclose transferring data for
creating the watermark.

Applicant argues:

"Furthermore, <u>Yoshiura</u> does not disclose creating a "material identifier."" (see
page 7, 2nd paragraph, Applicant's Arguments/Remarks)

Examiner maintains:

The independent claims are rejected on 35 USC § 103, utlizing references
Yoshiura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,131,162) in view of Musgrave (U.S. Patent No.
6,208,746 B1), and further in view of Milsted et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,345,256 B1).

Milsted discloses "A method to automatically retrieve data associated with
content. An <u>identifier</u> is read that is stored on electronic readable medium storing

content. The <u>identifier</u> is used to search a database for data associated with the content" (see abstract, lines 1-4 of Milsted, emphasis added).

Milsted further discloses "creating an identifier based on a data length of the content" (see claim 12 of Milsted).

Therefore, the references disclose creating the material identifier.

Applicant argues:

"Furthermore, the outstanding Office Action alleges that the signature is transferred from the client (purchaser) to the server (content provider). However, this is not the case." (see page 7, 3rd paragraph, Applicant's Arguments/Remarks)

Examiner maintains:

Yoshiura discloses that "That is, in the sixth embodiment, the consumer terminal [i.e., the client] extracts the mark [i.e., digital signature] to be validated from the Web page, and sends the extracted mark and a validity check request to the mark management server [i.e., the server] ." (see column 32, lines 16-19; and column 24, lines 41-46, of Yoshiura, emphasis added).

Therefore, Yoshiura discloses that the signature is transferred from the client to the server.

Conclusion

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Pan whose telephone number is 571-272-5987.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached at 571-272-3859. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Joseph Pan

June 18, 2007